

aa
cmo
15. (NEW) The broadcast video image recording apparatus according to claim 12, wherein said control unit has a storage management table for storing storage addresses of each broadcast image data stored in said first random-access storage unit, and wherein said control unit searches said indicated video image data by referencing said storage management table.

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 25 are pending, claim 1 has been amended and claims 10-15 have been added. No new matter is being presented.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. (U.S. Patent 5,825,967) in view of Hooper et al. (U.S. Patent 5,442,390). This rejection is respectfully traversed in light of the following remarks.

Stewart discloses a video editing system for video images of a VTR. The system disclosed in Stewart includes a VTR for bulk storage of video clips, a video disk for storing one or more video clips from the VTR, an image processor for processing video data from the video disk to produce an edited video clip, an editing memory for storing set-up data and edited video data and a stylus and touch device for inputting a video selection and modifications by the user. Thus, according to Stewart, a video clip in the VTR is transferred to and stored on a video disk and the editing memory is used to edit the video clip. The edited video clip is stored in the editing memory for future use.

Hooper discloses an on-demand video system comprising a video server, a network and customer equipment. The equipment includes a tv, a remote control and an interface. The interface has a receiver, random-access HDD video memory and a decompression/decoder. Thus, Hooper merely discloses an HDD video recorder for recording broadcast video image data to be reproduced on a tv.

The Examiner asserts that Stewart discloses a video editing system comprising a first storage unit (VTR), a second storage unit (editing memory) and a control unit for search the first storage unit and storing the indicated video image in the second storage unit. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion.

Specifically, Stewart discloses a video editing system but not a broadcast image data recorder, as claimed in the pending claims of this application. In other words, the editing memory is a temporary memory for editing but is not a storage unit to finally store video image data for the user.

The Examiner further asserts that Hooper discloses a customer terminal for receiving, recording and reproducing broadcast video image data. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to modify Stewart to process broadcast video data, as taught by Hooper. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, Stewart discloses an editing apparatus and Hooper discloses a broadcast terminal, which is very different from an editing apparatus.

Second, Stewart discloses a first storage unit (VTR) which is not even connected to a receiver to broadcast video image data.

However, claim 1 recites "a first storage unit storing said received broadcast video image data" As stated above, Stewart fails to disclose or suggest a first storage unit as claimed in claim 1. Further, claim 1 recites "a control unit controlling said first storage unit so as to store said received broadcast video image, searching and reading said indicated video image data from said first storage unit, and storing the indicated video image data in said second storage unit." Applicant respectfully asserts that Stewart fails to disclose or suggest the control unit as claimed. In addition, Hooper also fails to disclose or suggest the control unit as claimed.

Accordingly, even if Hooper teaches a double memory device for video image data and Hooper teaches a HDD recorder for broadcast image data, the combination of these references would fail to teach or suggest a broadcast recorder for recording broadcast image data which

was broadcast at time previous to the time when the video recording was requested. While Hooper may broadcasts image data at this previous time, it does not teach or suggest video recording back to this previous time.

Accordingly, the features of claim 1 are neither disclose nor suggested by the prior art of record, either alone or in combination.

Claims 2-9 are allowable at least due to their dependency from claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. (U.S. Patent 5,825,967) in view of Yuen et al. (U.S. Patent 5,335,079). Claims 8-9 are allowable at least due to their dependency from claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims 10-15

Claims 10 through 15 have been newly added. These claims are allowable according to the foregoing remarks with respect to claim 1.


Conclusion

As stated above, the foregoing claim amendments merely clarify a previously considered aspect of the present invention and no further search and/or consideration is required by the Examiner.

In light of the amendments and remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By 
Deborah S. Gladstein
Registration No. 43,636

Date: December 26, 2000
700 Eleventh Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500